DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Meadowood Project
GPA04-002; SP04-001; R04-004; TM5354; S04-005, S04-006, S04-007
and Log No. ER 04-02-004
SCH #2004051028

Lead Agency:

County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92123

August 21, 2009

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Meadowood Project
GPA04-002; SP04-001; R04-004; TM5354; S04-005, S04-006, S04-007;
and Log No. ER 04-02-004;
SCH #2004051028

Lead Agency:

County of San Diego
Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92123
Contact: Mr. Dennis Campbell, DPLU Project Manager
Phone: (858) 694-3737
Contact: Ms. Kristin Blackson, Environmental Coordinator
Phone: (858) 694-3012

EIR Preparer:

RECON Environmental, Inc.
1927 Fifth Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 308-9333

Project Proponent:

Pardee Homes

August 21, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

TECHNICAL APPENDIXES

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
ACM	Asbestos Containing Materials
ACOE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
ADT	Average Daily Trips
af/y	Acre-feet per year
AQIA	Air Quality Impact Assessments
AST	Aboveground storage tanks
AWM	Department of Agriculture Weights and Measures
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMO	Biological Mitigation Ordinance
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BUESD	Bonsall Union Elementary School District
CAA	Clean Air Act
CalArp	California Accidental Release Prevention Program
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CALINE	California Line Source Model
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCAP	Climate Change Action Plan
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEC	California Education Code
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFS	Cubic feet per second
CHHSLs	California Human Health Screening Levels
CLOMR	Conditional Letter of Map Revision
CMP	Congestion Management Plan
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Data Base
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon monoxide
County	County of San Diego
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
CUDA	Current Urban Development Area
CUWCC	California Urban Water Conservation Council
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	Decibels
dBA	A-weighted decibels
DEH	Department of Environmental Health
DHS	California Department of Health Services
DMP	Drought Management Plan
DPLU	Department of Planning and Land Use
DTAC	Departmental Transportation Advisory Committee
du/ac	Dwelling units per acre

EDU	Equivalent dwelling units
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMFAC	Emission Factor
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environment Site Assessment
ESP	Emergency Storage Project
º F	Degrees Fahrenheit
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FPP	Fire Protection Plan
FUESD	Fallbrook Union Elementary School District
FUHSD	Fallbrook Union High School District
GHG	Greenhouse gases
GPA	General Plan Amendment
GWP	Global warming potential
HAs	Hydrologic Areas
HAPs	Hazardous Air Pollutants
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
HLP	Habitat Loss Permit
HMD	Hazard Management Department
HMBP	Hazardous Materials Business Plan
HMP	Habitat Management Plan
HOA	Homeowners' Association
I-15	Interstate 15
IRP	Integrated Resource Planning
KOP	Key Observation Point
kWh	Kilowatt hours
LAFCO	Local Agency Formation Commission
LBP	Lead Based Paint
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LCS	Lead-containing surfaces
LEFMP	Law Enforcement Facilities Master Plan (2005)
LESA	Land Evaluation and Site Assessment
L_{eq}	Equivalent sound level
LID	Low Impact Development
LOMR	Letter of Map Revision
LOS	Level of service
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MBTRA	Migratory Bird Treaty Reform Act
MET	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

mgd	Million gallons per day
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
mpg	Miles per gallon
mph	Miles per hour
MRZ	Mineral resource zone
MSA	Major Statistical Area
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
MSL	Mean Sea Level
MSP	Master Specific Plan
MSPA	Master Specific Plan Area
MSR	Municipal Service Review
MUP	Major Use Permit
MWD	Municipal water district
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
NCFPD	North County Fire Protection District
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO_x	Nitrogen oxide
NO_2	Nitrogen dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NSLU	Noise Sensitive Land Use
ODS	Ozone depleting substance
OES	Office of Emergency Services
O_3	Ozone
PAMA	Pre-Approved Mitigation Area
Pb	Lead
PCC	Portland Cement Concrete
PCE	Primary Constituent Elements
PFA	Project Facility Availability
PFC	Project Facility Commitment
PFCs	Perfluorocarbons
$PM_{2.5}$	Particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns
PM_{10}	Particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns
ppm	Parts per million
pphm	Parts per hundred million
PRG	Preliminary Remediation Goals
PSR	Project Study Report
QSA	Quantification Settlement Agreement
RAQS	Regional Air Quality Strategy
RCP	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RDA	Rural Development Area
RFI	Request for Information
RMP	Risk Management Plan
RMWD	Rainbow Municipal Water District

ROG	Reactive organic gases
RPO	Resource Protection Ordinance
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWFMP	Regional Water Facilities Master Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SAM	Site Assessment and Mitigation Program
SAMP	Special Area Management Plan
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SANGIS	San Diego Geographic Information Systems
SB	Senate Bill
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCIC	South Coastal Information Center
SCW	South Coast Wildlands
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDCAPCD	San Diego County Air Pollution Control District
SDCWA	San Diego County Water Authority
SDG&E	San Diego Gas & Electric
SF_6	Sulfur hexafluoride
SG	Significance Guidelines
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SLRMWD	San Luis Rey Municipal Water District
SO_2	Sulfur dioxide
SOI	Sphere of Influence
SPA	Specific Plan Amendment
SRA	Subregional Areas
SR-76	State Route 76
SR-91	State Route 91
SSA	Special Study Area
STLC	Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration
STP	Shovel Test Pits
SWMP	Storm Water Management Plan
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	Toxic air contaminants
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
TCM	Transportation control measures
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TIF	Transportation Impact Fee
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TPH	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	Underground storage tank

UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
V/C	Volume to capacity ratio
VCMWD	Valley Center Municipal Water District
VMT	Vehicle miles traveled
VOCs	Volatile organic compounds
VTM	Vesting Tentative Map
WPO	Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance
WSA&V	Water Supply Assessment and Verification
WSDM	Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

Project Location

The proposed 389.5-acre Meadowood Project Site is located just north of State Route 76 (SR-76), approximately one-quarter mile east of Interstate 15 (I-15) in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area. The Meadowood project (Proposed Project) is located directly east and adjacent to the approved Palomar College campus project and the Campus Park and Campus Park West properties, which are planned communities active in the planning process. Southeast of the Project Site is Rosemary's Mountain Rock Quarry site, which has an approved Major Use Permit (MUP). The land to the north and east is undeveloped and consists of citrus and avocado orchards and natural open space.

Project Description

The Proposed Project entails the development of a residential community of up to 844 units (up to 886 dwelling units if the Bonsall School District decides not to build on the school site) with an overall density of 2.3 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Residential density within the planning areas ranges from 2.7 du/ac for the single-family units, to 13.5 du/ac for a portion of the multi-family units. The higher density planning areas are clustered in the flatter, western portions of the property, adjacent to the more urban uses proposed in the Campus Park and Campus Park West projects; while single-family residences are proposed in the higher elevations below the groves and open space.

The Proposed Project will consist of a mix of single-family and multi-family units, an elementary school site, a neighborhood park, pocket parks, 5.9 miles of multi-use trails and supporting infrastructure, including a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), water storage tanks, and nine detention basins. Open space is proposed to retain 49.3 acres of the existing citrus and avocado groves, along with 122.4 acres of sensitive biological habitat.

The main access will be taken via Horse Ranch Creek Road, which will extend north from SR-76 and connect to Pankey Road, which will then connect to Stewart Canyon Road. The internal street system would consist of two-lane residential streets to serve future residents. These streets are planned to ensure adequate circulation with the Campus Park, Palomar Community College District, and Campus Park West projects. A paved road, extending northeasterly from Street E to Rice Canyon Road, will provide fire access.

Development of the Proposed Project will be phased over several years. Phasing would be coordinated with the availability of water, sewer, fire protection, and school services. The Proposed Project would also be phased by recording several different final maps, but all the proposed development areas would be graded at one time. Each recorded map would be required to comply with the provisions and guidelines within the proposed Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment, which includes a Community Design Element containing policies to address visual quality aspects of the proposed common areas, including streetscape, entry treatments, parks, pedestrian circulation, lighting, signs, and landscaping.

Currently, the Proposed Project is partially within the San Luis Rey Municipal Water District (SLRMWD) and the remaining portion is not within the jurisdiction of any water or wastewater service provider. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) will examine the suitability of the three agencies in the project vicinity, the SLRMWD, the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD), and the Valley Center Municipal Water District (VCMWD), as potential service providers. Upon LAFCO's determination, the Proposed Project must be annexed into the appropriate Municipal Water District (MWD), as well as into the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MET). Regardless of the MWD that is selected, the applicant would construct all needed water and wastewater facilities to serve the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project seeks the following discretionary actions from the County:

- General Plan Amendment (GPA)
- Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)
- Rezone
- Vesting Tentative Map (VTM)
- MUP for operation of a WWTP
- Three site plans

In addition, annexation of the Proposed Project into the North County Fire Protection District (NCFPD) for fire protection services, into a MWD for water and wastewater service, and into the SDCWA and the MET for water service requires LAFCO's approval.

Project Objectives

The primary goal of the Proposed Project is to accommodate housing demand based on projected population increases while retaining the existing rural atmosphere in the area. Overall, the Proposed Project seeks to balance population and housing needs with open space, agricultural land use, and the development of infrastructure for the community. The specific project objectives are summarized as follows:

1. Provide a variety of residential land uses to allow for residential development that meets the demand for housing in the region consistent with the rustic charm of Fallbrook.

2. Provide an opportunity for home ownership by increasing the housing supply with a variety of owner occupied housing types in Fallbrook.

3. Provide for preservation of significant environmental and visual resources by conserving environmentally sensitive lands, prominent ridgelines, and regional wildlife corridors while recognizing and mitigating for wildfire potential.

4. Provide for land uses that relate to the community in conjunction with the three neighboring projects.

5. Maintain agricultural uses as a buffer to natural lands.

6. Provide educational and recreational opportunities in close proximity to residential uses, accessible by public roads and trails.

7. Coordinate public facilities and infrastructure with adjacent landowners and ensure availability concurrent with need.

8. Require permanent preservation of natural open space areas, while allowing public recreational opportunities.

9. Through LAFCO's Sphere of Influence (SOI) determination, identify the most efficient service provider to ensure provision of water, wastewater, and recycled water to support anticipated growth consistent with County of San Diego (County) land use decisions.

10. To provide fire and emergency services, potable water service, and wastewater service to the Project Site through annexation into the NCFPD and into a MWD, SDCWA, and MET.

Environmental Setting

The Project Site is within the unincorporated area of northern San Diego County, within the Fallbrook Community Planning Area. The topography is characterized by the east-west San Luis Rey River Valley along the SR-76 corridor and the north-south I-15 corridor. Both the San Luis Rey River floodplain and the I-15 corridor are flanked by rolling hills, which have historically been used for citrus and avocado groves, estate residences, and open space, with cattle grazing also occurring in the more rugged terrain. Row-crop agriculture is practiced to the east of the Monserate Mountain ridgeline, within Rice Canyon. A rocky outcrop, known as Rosemary's Mountain, comprises the southernmost toe of the Monserate Mountain ridge and abuts the southeastern corner of the Project Site.

Several hundred homes of varying types exist in the area surrounding the Project Site, including farm homes on large parcels with citrus and avocado groves, detached single-family homes in the Lake Rancho Viejo subdivision, and mobile homes in the Rancho Monserate Mobile Home Park.

There are several other development projects planned within the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project. Campus Park is the proposed project immediately adjacent to the Proposed Project on the west and includes single-family and multi-family residential uses, a town center, parks, office professional uses, and recreational facilities. Additionally, the Palomar Community College District proposes to build its North Education Center campus within a portion of the Campus Park project site. The proposed Campus Park West project is located at the northeast corner of I-15 and SR-76. The land comprising these three projects is currently primarily open space and pastureland.

The land to the north and east of the Project Site is undeveloped and consists of citrus and avocado groves and natural open space. South of SR-76 and the San Luis Rey River is the Lake Rancho Viejo residential project. West of I-15 and south of the San

Luis Rey River are the Rancho Monserate Mobile Home Park and the RMWD offices and work yard. There is a gas station, a restaurant, and a park-and-ride facility in the northwest quadrant of the I-15/SR-76 intersection. Additionally, to the west of I-15 are several residential and resort projects including Pala Mesa Highlands, Pala Mesa Condominiums, and the Pala Mesa Shopping Center.

The Project Site is characterized by diverse topography and a variety of vegetation types and habitats. It occupies the eastern portion of a well-defined valley surrounded by steep hills. The dominant feature is Monserate Mountain, the southern ridgeline of which occupies the eastern portion of the site. The topography of the Project Site ranges from gently sloping, sparsely vegetated terrain approximately 260 feet above mean sea level (MSL) at the southwestern end of the site, nearest to the San Luis Rey River, to the steeply sloping ridgeline along the northeastern portion of the site, which is the southern flank of Monserate Mountain with an elevation of approximately 840 feet above MSL. The eastern boundary descends into Rice Canyon, most of which is farther to the east. The site generally drains to the south and west and eventually into the San Luis Rey River.

The rugged and undeveloped terrain in the northern and eastern portions of the Project Site support disturbed and undisturbed southern mixed chaparral, coastal sage scrub vegetation, disturbed coastal sage scrub, and coast live oak woodland. Wetland areas on the Project Site support mixed willow-mule fat riparian scrub at the western boundary and two isolated freshwater ponds with limited vegetation. These ponds are artificial and are used to irrigate the crops. In addition, the Project Site includes non-native annual grassland and a network of graded dirt roads and other disturbed or developed areas.

Current land uses on-site include agricultural activities, consisting mostly of citrus and avocado orchards. These activities take up most of the central and southern portions, or about 54 percent of the site. There are 13 homes, sheds, and agricultural buildings scattered throughout the site, none of which are historic.

Environmental Constraints

Environmental issues constraining development that were considered in the design of the Proposed Project include the following:

- Sensitive Biological Resources. The Project Site is part of a regional network of significant biological resources along the San Luis Rey River. Resources include wetlands, coastal sage scrub, and chaparral. The Proposed Project has been designed to conserve key habitat and wildlife corridors through the dedication of 122.4 acres of open space.

- Utility Services. Water and wastewater services are not currently available to the Project Site. The applicant has coordinated with the appropriate MWDs to identify options for the provision of these services. A condition of approval of the Proposed Project will be the annexation into a MWD.

- Steep Slopes. Much of the Project Site contains steep slopes, as defined by County Ordinance, which includes a slope of 25 percent or greater which have a minimum rise of 50 feet. The Proposed Project has been designed to minimize development encroachment into these slopes.

- Visual Quality. The Project Site, especially the steeper slopes and ridges at the higher elevations, is visible from I-15 and adjacent homes and businesses along Pala Road. The visual characteristics of the property were considered in the Proposed Project design, which plans the more intense uses on the flatter portions of the Project Site at lower elevations. The prominent ridges and steeper slopes would be preserved in open space.

- Wildfire Hazards. The Project Site is in an area subject to wildfires and is within the SOI of the NCFPD. A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) has been prepared for the Proposed Project to reduce risks of wildfire hazards.

- To avoid impacting sensitive resources including agriculture, biology, steep slopes, and visual quality, the Proposed Project's design uses lot area averaging, in conformance with policies and regulations of the County of San Diego and the Fallbrook Community Plan.

S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis completed for the Proposed Project. Table S-1 also includes mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact has been mitigated to below a level of significance. Detailed analysis of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project is implemented are discussed in Chapter 2, significant environmental effects that can be mitigated are found in Chapter 3; and effects found not be significant during preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or the initial study process are found in Chapter 4.

Environmental design considerations that have been incorporated into the Proposed Project are listed in Table 1-5. These include standard measures to reduce environmental impacts associated with air quality, erosion, and water quality during grading and construction of the Proposed Project. Additional measures specifically related to the Proposed Project to address impacts associated with transportation, aesthetics, agriculture, biological resources, geology, and hazards are also included. All of these environmental design measures are detailed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 and are also included in Chapter 8 of this EIR.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed in April 2004 for a 30-day public review and comment period. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held in April 2004 at the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use. The NOP and all of the comment letters received are included in this EIR as Appendix B. The issues that were raised in the comments and forms by the public agencies, local groups, and individuals are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Chapters 2 through 5.

Issues of concern associated with the Proposed Project include the change in aesthetics and community character; land use intensity relative to the adopted County General Plan, the proposed General Plan Update, and the Fallbrook Community Plan; transportation/traffic, and the provision of water and sewer service to the Project Site.

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

Issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate the significant effects that would be created by the implementation of the Proposed Project. The County of San Diego Board of Supervisors will decide if the significant and unmitigated effects associated with aesthetics, air quality, and traffic can be reduced, whether feasible mitigation is available, and whether overriding considerations should be adopted. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors will determine whether the significant impacts associated with the environmental issues of agriculture, biology, cultural resources, noise, geology, and hazards have been fully mitigated to below a level of significance. The Board of Supervisors will also decide whether the Proposed Project conforms with the criteria set out in land use regulations and policies, including the Fallbrook Community Plan, and take into consideration the premise for the General Plan Update plan design. Lastly, the Board of Supervisors will decide whether any of the project alternatives substantially reduces significant impacts while still meeting the key project objectives.

S.5 Project Alternatives

A number of alternatives were considered during preparation of this EIR, including the following alternatives to the Proposed Project:

- No Project (No Development) Alternative
- No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative
- Groundwater Dependent (Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative
- Reduced Grading Alternative
- Proposed General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update)
- Proposed General Plan Update Referral Map Alternative (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update)

A summary of the conclusions is provided below with the full analysis found in Chapter 5 of the EIR.

Analysis of the No Project (No Development) Alternative (Subchapter 5.2)

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), the No Project Alternative includes a discussion of the existing conditions at the time the NOP is published and no development would occur (Alternative 1) or a discussion of a circumstance in which the Proposed Project does not proceed, but taking into account what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future (Alternative 2). The EIR considers both scenarios.

Under the No Project (No Development) Alternative, the Project Site would remain as it is today, consisting primarily of agricultural uses. The No Project (No Development)

Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because it would avoid significant unmitigated impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic, as well as reduce significant and mitigated impacts associated with biological and agricultural resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials for the Proposed Project. This alternative would not develop housing nor meet any of the Proposed Project's objectives.

Analysis of the No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative (Subchapter 5.3)

The No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative applies the two existing General Plan Designations, (18) Multiple Rural Use and (21) Specific Plan Area, with an overall density of 2.75 du/ac. There are 297.5 acres in the (18) Multiple Rural Use area, which requires a minimum lot size of 4, 8, or 20 acres, depending on slope. The (18) Multiple Rural Use area would yield approximately 33 dwelling units on 4-, 8-, or 20-acre lots. There are 92 acres in the (21) Specific Plan Area portion of the Project Site, which would yield approximately 229 single-family dwelling units on 10,000-square-foot and half-acre lots. Therefore, the No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative would produce approximately 262 single-family dwelling units.

The No Project (Development Consistent with the Adopted General Plan) Alternative would result in reducing significant and unmitigated air quality impacts to a level which would be mitigated. Significant unmitigated aesthetics and transportation/traffic would remain. Impacts related to biological resources and agricultural resources would be greater. Significant and mitigated impacts anticipated are associated with geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials would be similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative would not attain the following five of the ten project objectives. This alternative would not provide a variety of housing types (Objectives 1), preserve biological and visual resources (Objective 3), preserve ongoing agriculture (Objective 5), provide educational and recreational opportunities (Objective 6), or provide permanent preservation of natural open spaces (Objective 8).

Analysis of the Groundwater Dependent (Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative (Subchapter 5.4)

The Groundwater Dependent (Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative relies on groundwater to sustain development consistent with the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance. Under this alternative, the Groundwater Ordinance would restrict lot sizes based on annual average rainfall. The ordinance would require a minimum lot size of eight acres. Therefore, 46 eight-acre single-family lots could be accommodated on the site and would be dependent on private wells and on-site septic systems instead of sanitary sewer and water.

The Groundwater Dependent (Development Consistent with the Groundwater Ordinance) Alternative would yield 46 residences, most likely dependent on private wells and on-site septic systems instead of sanitary sewer and water. An elementary school site and park would not be provided under this alternative. This alternative would avoid significant unmitigated impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic, as well as reduce significant and mitigated impacts associated with, geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials for

the Proposed Project. Impacts related to biological resources and agricultural resources would be greater as there would be no provision for dedication of open space easements.

This alternative would not attain the following eight of the ten project objectives. This alternative would not provide a variety of housing types (Objective 1), provide a great increase in housing supply (Objective 2); preserve biological and visual resources (Objective 3); preserve ongoing agriculture (Objective 5); provide educational and recreational opportunities (Objective 6), and provide permanent preservation of natural open spaces (Objective 8). This alternative will not require a LAFCO SOI determination or selection of MWD to serve the Project Site (Objectives 9 and 10).

Analysis of the Reduced Grading Alternative (Subchapter 5.5)

The rationale for the selection of a Reduced Grading Alternative is to minimize alteration of the topography and maximize the preservation of biological and agricultural resources. The Reduced Grading Alternative would entail clustering development on the area of the Project Site with less than 15 percent slope gradient with all remaining land (approximately 300 acres) preserved as open space. Such development is likely to include three-story multi-family buildings, with possible underground parking. The remaining 38.5-acre area would be utilized as a combined park and elementary school. The Reduced Grading Alternative would yield 1,138 multi-family residential units, an increase of 241 units. This alternative would result in reducing the Proposed Project's significant and mitigated impacts related to biological resources and agricultural resources. It would result in similar significant and unmitigated impacts to aesthetics, air quality, and transportation/traffic, and to significant and mitigated impacts to geology and soils, cultural resources, noise, and hazards/hazardous materials.

This alternative would attain all but two project objectives. It would not meet the objective of providing a variety of housing because it would only offer a multi-family option (Objective 1). It would also not provide an opportunity for increasing a variety of housing (Objective 2).

This alternative would attain all but two project objectives. It would not meet the objective of providing a variety of housing because it would only offer a multi-family option (Objective 1). It would also not provide an opportunity for increasing a variety of housing (Objective 2).

Analysis of the Proposed General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update) Alternative (Subchapter 5.6)

The General Plan Update Draft Land Use Map Alternative would allow the construction of a community consisting of 1,168 single- and multi-family units and 1.8 acres of neighborhood commercial.

Due to the fact that the development footprint would be the same as the Proposed Project, impacts associated with aesthetics (significant and unmitigable), and impacts to biological resources, agricultural resources, and cultural resources, geology and soils and hazards/hazardous materials (significant and mitigated) would be similar to the Proposed Project. Due to the increase in the number of units and addition of

neighborhood commercial use, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with air quality, transportation/traffic and noise. Significant unmitigated impacts associated with the Proposed Project would remain. This alternative would attain all of the project objectives.

Analysis of the Proposed General Plan Update Referral Map (Development Consistent with the San Diego County General Plan Update Referral Map) Alternative (Subchapter 5.7)

The General Plan Update Referral Map Alternative would allow the construction of a community with a 1.8-acre neighborhood commercial center and single and multi-family residences totaling 536 dwelling units.

Due to the fact that the development footprint would be the same as the Proposed Project, impacts associated with significant and unmitigated aesthetics, and impacts to significant and mitigated biological resources, agricultural resources, and cultural resources would be similar to the Proposed Project. This alternative would also result in similar impacts associated with geology and soils and hazards/hazardous materials (significant and mitigated). Given the reduction in the number of traffic trips, this alternative would have less impacts associated with air quality and transportation/traffic, although they would remain significant and unmitigated. With the addition of the neighborhood commercial use, this alternative would have greater impacts associated with noise.

This alternative would attain all of the project objectives. However, Objectives 1 (variety of residential land uses) and 2 (increasing housing supply) would not be reached at the same level as the Proposed Project.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Although the No Project (No Development) Alternative and the No Project (Adopted General Plan) Alternative would result in minimal or substantially reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. As such, the Reduced Grading Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative due to its potential for maximizing retention of the natural landform and steep hillsides and preservation of biological and agricultural resources.

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.1 Aesthetics	A-1. Visible construction activities would significantly contrast with the existing visual environment due to removal of existing vegetation and the introduction of new, visually dominant elements such as newly cut or fill slopes, construction fencing, construction equipment, and construction materials stockpiling and storage.	M-A-1. Direct impacts resulting from short-term construction would remain significant. There is no feasible mitigation available to lessen these short-term effects.	Significant and unmitigable
	A-2. The cumulative introduction (Campus Park, Campus Park West, Palomar College, Pala Mesa Highlands, along with the Proposed Project) of a large number of buildings and suburban elements into areas that are currently undeveloped or used for agriculture would create a major change in the existing visual character of the viewshed.	M-A-2: Design measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Project that would reduce direct impacts to existing visual character and quality. However, there is no feasible mitigation available to lessen the cumulative effects.	Significant and unmitigable
	A-3. Some or all of the four nearby projects, Campus Park, Campus Park West, Palomar College, Pala Mesa Highlands, along with the Proposed Project, would be visible from the proposed San Luis Rey River Trail, the Engle Family Preserve, and Monserate Mountain Trail. The proposed cumulative projects would create a major change to the views from the surrounding areas and trails.	M-A-3: Design measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Project that would reduce direct impacts to existing visual character and quality. However, there is no feasible mitigation available to lessen the cumulative effects.	Significant and unmitigable
2.2 Air Quality	AQ-1. Densities included in the Proposed Project are not consistent with the existing, adopted San Diego County General Plan and the Fallbrook CP, and were not considered in the development of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) for the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB).	M-AQ-1. The Proposed Project is not considered in SANDAG growth projects and thus is not consistent with the existing RAQS and the SIP. Until SANDAG updates the RAQS and SIP, there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact.	Significant and unmitigable

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.2 Air Quality (cont.)	AQ-2. The Proposed Project has the potential to result in emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) during the architectural coating (painting) phase of construction which exceeds thresholds.	M-AQ-2. During the architectural coatings (painting) phase of construction, the applicant shall use interior coatings with a VOC content less than or equal to 50 grams per liter; residential exterior coatings with a content less than or equal to 100 grams per liter; and non-residential exterior and interior coatings with a content less than or equal to 250 grams per liter.	Less than significant
	AQ-3. On-site operational and source emissions of reactive organic gas (ROG) and particulates (PM_{10}) will continue to violate air quality standards.	M-AQ-3. The Proposed Project design would promote walking, bicycle riding, and horseback riding as alternative forms of transportation to motorized vehicles and would reduce the projected operational emissions. However, this will not completely reduce emissions to a level below significance. No additional feasible mitigation is available, thus impacts would remain significant and unmitigatable.	Significant and unmitigable
	AQ-4. Health risks associated with construction-related activities due to emissions form diesel equipment would be significant.	M-AQ-4. To utilize Toxic-Best Available Control Technology (T-BACT) and mitigate for impacts, the applicant shall ensure that 10 percent of the construction fleet uses any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters and/or CARB certified Tier I, II, or III equipment.	Less than significant
	AQ-5. The Proposed Project, together with other projects in the area would result in growth not represented in SANDAG growth forecasts nor included in the current RAQS or SIP, thus representing a significant impact.	M-AQ-5. Until SANDAG updates the RAQS and SIP, there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact, thus impacts would be significant and unmitigable.	Significant and unmitigable

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
2.2 Air Quality (cont.)	AQ-6. Construction of the Proposed Project, together with other projects would result in emissions of diesel-fired particulate matter and result in a significant cumulative impact.	M-AQ-6. To ensure the use of T-BACT and mitigate for impacts, the applicant shall have 10 percent of the construction fleet use any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters and/or CARB certified Tier I, II, or III equipment.	Less than significant
	AQ-7. Implementation of the Proposed Project, along with other projects will result in the violation of air quality standards related to PM_{10} and ROG and creating a significant cumulative impact..	M-AQ-7. There is no feasible mitigation available to reduce this impact, thus impacts would be significant and unmitigable.	Significant and unmitigable
2.3 Transportation / Traffic	TR-1. The Proposed Project is calculated to have direct impacts at the intersection of Old Highway 395 / Reche Road	M-TR-1. The applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Old Highway 395 and Reche Road to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW.	Less than significant
	TR-2. The Proposed Project is calculated to have direct impacts at the following street segments: SR-76 from Via Monserate to Gird Road SR-76 from I-15 SB Ramp to I-15 NB Ramp	M-TR-2. Direct impacts to study area street/State Route segments shall be mitigated through the construction of one additional travel lane in each direction. The Caltrans SR-76 project proposes the widening of SR-76 from Via Monserate to Gird Road and SR-76 from the I-15 SB ramp to I-15 the NB ramp. Should the Caltrans project not be completed prior to the Proposed Project, the applicant shall make a fair share contribution to be allocated to the widening of SR-76, if feasible.	If the first residential unit within the Proposed Project is occupied prior to completion of the Caltrans SR-76 Middle project or SR-76 East project, impacts could remain significant and unmitigable
	TR-3. The Proposed Project is calculated to have cumulative impacts at the following intersections: SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Via Monserate SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Gird Road SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Sage Road SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Old Highway 395 SR-76 (Pala Rd) / I-15 SB Ramp	M-TR-3. Cumulative impacts to study area intersections shall be mitigated through applicant participation in the TIF program.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	SR-76 (Pala Rd) / I-15 NB Ramp SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Pankey Road SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Rice Canyon Road SR-76 (Pala Rd) / Couser Canyon Road Old Highway 395 / Pala Mesa Drive Old Highway 395 / Stewart Canyon Road Old Highway 395 / Reche Road Mission Road / Old Highway 395 Mission Road / I-15 Southbound Ramp Mission Road / I-15 Northbound Ramp SR-76 (Mission Ave) / E Vista Way SR-76 (Mission Ave) / North River Road SR-76 (Mission Ave) / Olive Hill Road SR-76 (Mission Ave) / S. Mission Road		
2.3 Transportation / Traffic (cont.)	TR-4. The Proposed Project is calculated to have cumulative impacts to the following street segments: Old Highway 395 from E. Mission Rd to Reche Rd Old Highway 395 from Reche Rd to Stewart Canyon Rd Old Highway 395 from Pala Mesa Dr to SR-76 SR-76 from E Vista Way to North River Road SR-76 from North River Road to Olive Hill Road SR-76 from Olive Hill Road to S Mission Road	M-TR-4. Cumulative impacts to study area street/State Route segments shall be mitigated through applicant participation in the TIF program.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	SR-76 from S Mission Road to Via Monserate SR-76 from Via Monserate to Gird Road SR-76 from Gird Road to Sage Road SR-76 from Sage Road to Old Highway 395 SR-76 from I-15 SB Ramp to I-15 NB Ramp SR-76 from Horse Ranch Creek Road to Rice Canyon Road SR-76 from Rice Canyon Road to Couser Canyon Road SR-76 from Couser Canyon Road to Pala Mission Road		
3.1 Biological Resources	BR-1. Construction activities in the vicinity of arroyo toads and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.	M-BR-1. To mitigate indirect construction-related impacts on the arroyo toad, the owner/permittee shall, using a qualified biologist, implement the following mitigation measure(s): a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area and identify locations for placement of protective fencing. The project biologist shall continue to monitor grading activities. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downs lope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss. c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist. d. A storm drain system and detention basins shall be constructed to restrict excess water flow from proposed roads and structures associated with the Meadowood project. Filter devices shall be installed at the appropriate points to ensure that run-off is cleansed before reaching the basins. All water-catchment features shall be located above graded and natural slopes. e. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from riparian and upland habitat adjacent to the development.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-2. The Proposed Project would remove a total of 14.5 acres of gnatcatcher habitat, including 13.5 acres of Designated Critical Habitat and 1.0 acres of gnatcatcher habitat are outside the Critical Habitat boundaries.	M-BR-2. Permanent direct impacts to a total of 14.5 acres on- and off-site, of suitable habitat for California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated on-site at a ratio of 2:1 for a total of 29.0 acres. A total of 74.5 acres of habitat shall be preserved in the proposed on-site open space easement. The mitigation land shall also cover impacts to designated Critical Habitat for the California gnatcatcher as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3).	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		Temporary direct impacts to a total of 0.3 acre on- and off-site shall be mitigated through revegetation of the coastal sage scrub with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. Take authorization of the California gnatcatcher and removal of coastal sage scrub habitat shall be obtained through the Section 7 consultation with the USFWS.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-3.1. Construction activities in the vicinity of California gnatcatchers and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased noise, increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.	M-BR-3.1. Indirect impacts on the California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant: a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist. d. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from coastal sage scrub habitat adjacent to the development. e. Permanent fencing and signage shall be placed along the trails and/or between the development open space interface in compliance with County standards and as shown on the Landscape Concept Plans.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-3.2. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to the California gnatcatcher.	M-BR-3.2. Direct impacts on the California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant: a. Habitats shall be mitigated on site at a ratio of 2:1 for coastal sage scrub and disturbed coastal sage scrub for a total of 29.0 acres or in accordance with the County guidelines. Temporary impacts would be mitigated through revegetation of the coastal sage scrub with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. b. A qualified biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the boundary of the development area as shown on the approved grading plans. The location and design for	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		fencing shall be recommended and subsequently installed by a qualified biologist. c. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with construction, a "directed" survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the California gnatcatcher on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (February 15 through August 31). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits. d. Construction noise shall continue to be monitored to verify that noise levels are not adversely affecting behavior and are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Sound barriers shall be put in place if construction noise exceeds 60 db(A) in the immediate vicinity of an active gnatcatcher nest.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-4. The Proposed Project would result in significant permanent direct impacts resulting from off-site improvement areas would remove approximately 3.7 acres of occupied least Bell's vireo habitat (southern willow scrub and southern arroyo willow riparian forest) and temporary impacts to 2.2 acres.	M-BR-4. Impacts to least Bell's vireo habitat shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 for a total of 11.1 acres to be purchased off-site. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. The habitat shall be a southern willow scrub or willow riparian forest habitat which can be occupied by least Bell's vireo as detailed in the Wetlands Mitigation Plan.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		Temporary direct impacts to 2.2 acres shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian habitat with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-5.1 Construction activities in the vicinity of least Bell's vireo and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased noise, increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.	M-BR-5.1. Indirect impacts to least Bell's vireo shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant: a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss. c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist. d. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from riparian habitat adjacent to the development.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-5.2. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to the least Bell's vireo.	M-BR-5.2. Direct impacts to least Bell's vireo shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant: a. Vireo habitat shall be mitigated at 3:1 for riparian vegetation types for a total of 11.1 acres. Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian vegetation with the same species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. The off-site location, land manager, and conservation status of the mitigation land shall be identified prior to Final Map recordation. The habitat shall be a southern willow scrub or willow riparian forest habitat occupied by least Bell's vireo similar to that affected by the Proposed Project and as detailed in the Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4). b. A qualified biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the boundary of the development area as shown on the approved grading plans. The location and design for fencing shall be recommended and subsequently installed by a qualified biologist. c. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with project construction, a "directed survey" shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the least Bell's vireo on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (March 15 through September 15). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits. d. Construction noise shall continue to be monitored to verify that noise levels are not adversely affecting behavior and are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Sound barriers shall be put in place if construction noise exceeds 60 db(A) in the immediate vicinity of an active vireo nest.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-6. The permanent removal of 3.7 acres of suitable habitat and temporary impacts to 2.20 acres of suitable habitat for southwestern willow flycatcher would be considered a significant impact.	M-BR-6. Impacts to southwestern willow flycatcher habitat shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 for a total of 11.1 acres to be purchased off-site as detailed in the Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4). This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. Temporary direct impacts to 2.2 acres of suitable habitat shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian habitat with the same species present within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	Less than significant
	BR-7.1. Construction activities in the vicinity of least southwestern willow flycatcher and their habitat may result in indirect impacts caused by increased noise, increased nighttime lighting, erosion, and debris or construction equipment in the preserved habitat.	M-BR-7.1. Indirect impacts on the southwestern willow flycatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant:	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		a. The project biologist shall meet with the owner, permittee or designee, and the construction crew to conduct an on site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved development area. b. During grading activities, Best Management Practices for erosion control shall be implemented and monitored as needed to prevent any significant sediment transport. These practices may include, but may not be limited to, the following: the use of materials such as sandbags; sediment fencing and erosion control matting to stabilize disturbed areas; and installation of erosion control materials, particularly on the downslope side of disturbed areas, to prevent soil loss. c. All construction activities shall take place only inside the fenced area. Grading materials shall be stored either inside the fenced development area or in an area approved by the project biologist. d. Nighttime lighting shall be shielded and directed away from riparian habitat adjacent to the development.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-7.2. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in significant direct impacts to the southwestern willow flycatcher.	BR-7.2. Direct impacts on the southwestern willow flycatcher shall be mitigated by the following measures to be implemented by the project applicant: a. Impacts to flycatcher habitat shall be mitigated at 3:1 for riparian vegetation types for a total of 11.1 acres. Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation of the riparian vegetation with the same species found within	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This mitigation shall be incorporated into the Section 7 consultation. b. A qualified biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the boundary of the development area as shown on the approved grading plans. The location and design for fencing shall be recommended and subsequently installed by a qualified biologist. c. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with project construction, a "directed" survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the southwestern willow flycatcher on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (May 1 through September 1). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits. d. Construction noise shall continue to be monitored to verify that noise levels are not adversely affecting behavior and are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Sound barriers shall be put in place if construction noise exceeds 60 db(A) in the immediate vicinity of an active	

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		flycatcher nest.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-8. Development of the Proposed Project will permanently (direct and indirect) impact foraging habitat on- and off-site. These impacts include 14.5 acres of coastal sage scrub, 2.2 acres of southern mixed chaparral, 30.2 acres of pasture and 15.3 acres of non-native grassland for a total of 62.2 acres of habitat. Temporary impacts include 0.3 acre coastal sage scrub, 0.2 acre of southern mixed chaparral, and 5.0 acres of pasture and non-native grassland for a total of 5.5 acres of habitat..	M-BR-8. Permanent direct impacts to 62.2 acres of foraging habitat for birds of prey and other special status species shall be mitigated through preservation of 122.4 acres of open space on-site within a regional open space network as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). Temporary impacts would be mitigated through revegetation of foraging habitat with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan. Indirect impacts shall be mitigated by the following measures: a. Shielding lighting away from the open space. b. Monitoring noise levels during construction. c. Use of range construction fencing, and silt fencing. d. Permanent fencing and signage shall be placed along the trails and/or between the development open space interface in order to be compliant with County standards and as shown on the Landscape Concept Plans.	Less than significant
	BR-9. The Proposed Project could result in impacts to marginal, yet occupied habitat for the western spadefoot.	M-BR-9. Impacts to the western spadefoot shall be mitigated by the purchase of 11.1 acres of riparian forest and scrub habitat. Additionally, prior to grading, a written relocation plan shall be prepared and approved by the County and CDFG. In accordance with the plan,	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		western spadefoot toads shall be trapped and relocated The timing and duration of the relocation program shall be based on the activity period of the western spadefoot (generally associated with rainfall and temperature) and proposed construction schedule. Trapping shall occur along the existing pitfall traps located along the western and southern property boundaries and monitored prior to and during proposed construction activities. Any western spadefoot found in the traps shall be collected, noted and relocated to predetermined receptor sites within the region. Trapping and relocation shall be conducted by a biologist familiar with the biological natural history of the western spadefoot and possesses a CDFG Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for conducting these activities. At the end of the relocation effort, the biologist shall prepare a summary report noting the number of western spadefoot relocated, the location of the area to which they were moved, and other pertinent facts. The report shall be submitted to the County and CDFG.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-10. Development of the Proposed Project will permanently and temporarily impact on- and off-site foraging habitat potentially supporting special status wildlife.	M-BR-10. Permanent and temporary impacts to the 14 special status wildlife species identified on-site shall be mitigated through preservation of 122.4 acres of open space on-site within a regional open space network as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3).	Less than significant
	BR-11. The Proposed Project would impact habitat for a variety of native bird species including raptors and nests of species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.	M-BR-11. Impacts to nesting birds shall be mitigated through the following measures: a. Vegetation clearing shall take place outside of	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		the nesting season, roughly defined as mid-February to mid-September. Vegetation clearing activities could occur within potential nesting habitat during the breeding season with written concurrence from the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU), the USFWS, and the CDFG that nesting birds would be avoided. If vegetation removal is to take place during the nesting season, a biologist shall be present during vegetation clearing operations to search for and flag active nests so that they can be avoided. b. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing during the nesting/breeding season for raptors (roughly from mid-February through mid-July), a "directed" survey shall be conducted to locate active raptor nests, if any. If active raptor nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of any active nesting sites. The project proponent may seek approval from the Director of DPLU if nesting activities cease prior to July 15. c. Prior to any grading or native vegetation clearing associated with project construction, a "directed" survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of the California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher on-site and, if found to be present, to locate active nests (if any). If active nests are present, no grading or removal of habitat shall take place within 500 feet of active nesting sites during the nesting/breeding season (February 15 through	

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		August 31 for gnatcatcher, March 15 through September 15 for vireo, and May 1 through September 1 for flycatcher). Should active nests be abandoned prior to the end of the expected breeding season, grading and construction may proceed within approved grading limits.	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-12. External community lighting may have an effect on species near the edge of open space if it is allowed to shine into preserved areas.	M-BR-12. General indirect impacts associated with external community lighting shall be mitigated through the requirement that all communal lighting be shielded and directed away from the urban/natural edge. The Proposed Project shall be designed to be in compliance with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.101-59.115). A lighting plan shall be included in the grading plans which shows required lighting adjacent to the open space as being shielded, unidirectional, low pressure sodium illumination (or similar), and directed away from preserve areas using appropriate placement and shields.	Less than significant
	BR-13. The Proposed Project would permanently remove approximately 12.6 acres on-site, and approximately 1.9 acres off-site, for a total of 14.5 acres of coastal sage scrub. Temporary impacts include 0.2 acre on-site and 0.1 acres off-site.	M-BR-13. Permanent impacts to coastal sage scrub and disturbed coast sage scrub shall be mitigated at the ratio of 2:1 totaling 29.0 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of coastal sage scrub preserved on-site is 74.5 acres). Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-14. The Proposed Project would remove approximately 2.2 acres of southern mixed chaparral vegetation on-site.	M-BR-14. Permanent impacts to southern mixed chaparral shall be mitigated at the ratio of 0.5:1 totaling 1.1 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of southern mixed chaparral preserved on-site is 17.5 acres).	Less than significant
	BR-15. The Proposed Project would remove approximately 0.1 acre on-site and approximately 0.2 acre off-site, for a total of 0.3 acre.	M-BR-15. Permanent impacts to coast live oak shall be mitigated at the ratio of 3:1 totaling 0.9 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of coast live oak woodland preserved on-site is 1.7 acres).	Less than significant
	BR-16. The Proposed Project would remove approximately 9.9 acres of non-native grassland on-site and approximately 5.4 acres off-site for a total of 15. 3 acres. Temporary impacts include less than 0.1 acre onsite and 2.1 acres off-site.	M-BR-16. Permanent impacts to non-native grassland shall be mitigated at the ratio of 0.5:1 totaling 7.7 acres within the 122.4 acre proposed on-site open space easement as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3). (Actual amount of non-native grassland preserved on-site is 22.0 acres).	Less than significant
	BR-17. Proposed development would result in the removal of approximately 1.5 acres of pastureland on-site and 28.7 acres off-site for a total of 30.2 acres. Temporary impacts include 2.8 acres off-site.	M-BR-17. Permanent impacts to pastureland shall be mitigated at the ratio of 0.5:1 totaling 15.1 acres of non-native grassland. A portion of the mitigation shall be on-site within the proposed open space easement. An additional 2.7 acres of mitigation land is required and shall be preserved off-site as detailed in the Conceptual Resource Management Plan (Appendix F-3).	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-18. Proposed development would result in the removal of 0.1 acres of willow/mule fat scrub on-site and less than one acre southern willow scrub, 3.7 acres southern arroyo willow riparian forest, and 0.9 acre freshwater marsh off-site.	M-BR-18. Impacts willow/mule fat scrub, southern willow scrub, southern arroyo willow riparian forest, and freshwater marsh off-site shall be mitigated through dedication, restoration, creation and/or enhancement of wetlands at a ratio of 3:1 for a total of 12.3 acres or as defined through required state and federal wetland permits as detailed the Wetland Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4). Temporary impacts shall be mitigated through revegetation with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	Less than significant
	BR-19. Proposed development would result in the On- and off-site impacts to jurisdictional wetlands.	M-BR-19. Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands shall follow the terms and conditions of permits and agreements with ACOE and CDFG. Permanent impacts shall be mitigated at a ratio of 3:1 and shall consist of purchase and dedication of replacement habitat, creation of wetlands, and revegetation of disturbed riparian habitat. Mitigation measures for impacts to ACOE jurisdictional wetlands, CDFG vegetated riparian habitat, and County wetlands are listed as follows: • ACOE jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 0.83 acre on-site and 2.29 acres off-site, for a total of 3.12 acres of ACOE jurisdictional waters and wetlands shall be mitigated with 9.36 acres of ACOE jurisdictional waters and wetlands. • CDFG jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 0.93 acres on-site and 2.29 acres off-site, for a total of 3.22 acres of CDFG jurisdictional waters and vegetated riparian habitat shall be	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		mitigated with 9.66 acres of CDFG jurisdictional waters and vegetated riparian habitat. • RPO jurisdiction: Permanent impacts to 2.29 acres of RPO wetlands off-site shall be mitigated with 6.87 acres of RPO wetlands. Details are contained within the Wetlands Mitigation Plan (Appendix F-4). .	
3.1 Biological Resources (cont.)	BR-20. Temporary impacts to jurisdictional wetlands on- and off-site totaling 2.04 acres.	M-BR-20. Temporary impacts to 2.04 acres of jurisdictional wetlands shall be mitigated through revegetation with the same plant species found within the impact area. The revegetation areas are shown on the Conceptual Landscape Plan.	Less than significant
3.2 Agriculture Resources	AG-1. The implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the conversion of 6.3 acres of Prime Farmland, 99.9 acres of Unique Farmland, and 54.2 acres of Farmland to non-agricultural use.	M-AG-1/M-AG-2. The Proposed Project shall retain 49.3 acres of existing citrus and avocado groves in agricultural open space, thereby providing for the continued growth of citrus and avocado groves..	Less than significant
	AG-2. The Proposed Project, together with other projects, would result in a significant cumulative loss of agricultural land.		Less than significant
3.3 Geology and Soils	GE-1. Standard design measures would not completely eliminate the risks associated with liquefaction within the Project Site.	M-GE-1. The applicant shall raise the existing grade while also removing and re-compacting the alluvium above the groundwater table to increase the overburden pressure over the liquefiable deposits as recommended by the geotechnical engineer.	Less than significant
	GE-2. The potential exists for rockfall from the west-facing slope of Rosemary's Mountain due to seismic or erosional events. The project design will	M-GE-2. Mitigation of rockfall potential shall consist of: (1) identifying boulders that have a high potential for rockfall and breaking and/or removing	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
	incorporate features to reduce impacts from rockfall and soil instability, but these standard project design measures would not completely eliminate risks associated with rockfall.	these rocks from the hillside; (2) identifying boulders that have a less significant rockfall potential, testing these rocks with excavation equipment, and removing rocks that move or appear to be unstable; and (3) monitoring rocks during development of the Proposed Project. 1) Boulders identified as having a high potential (eroded at the base or entirely free from the soil) shall be broken and removed from the slope, or alternatively rock bolted to the slope. This will require use of an excavator with a rock breaking device or drilling the rock and using chemicals that break rock, or the use of anchors to pin the rock to the slope. Large rocks that are impractical to completely remove or anchor to the slope shall be broken down such that they are relatively flat or on contour with the slope face to create a rock with a shape that will not roll. 2) Boulders identified as having a less significant rockfall potential shall be tested by applying pressure with the excavator. If the boulders move they shall be mitigated as recommended under No. 1. Boulders that are small enough such that they can easily be moved shall be pushed or rolled down the slope. 3) During the monitoring period after a period of heavy rain, the boulders shall be observed to assess if runoff has caused undermining of the downhill side of the boulder. Removal and/or breaking of the boulders as recommended shall be performed if undermining occurs.	

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.4 Cultural Resources	CR-1. Project construction could impact significant subsurface deposits associated with the Monserate Adobe.	M-CR-1. A professional archaeologist shall monitor grading in the vicinity of the mapped location of the Monserate Adobe, as well as the area north of SR-76. A Monitoring Discovery Plan shall be prepared prior to commencement of construction activity, to be put in use in the event historic deposits are discovered. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing, and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.	Less than significant
	CR-2. Cultural resources on the Project Site include archaeological site CA-SDI-682 which is identified as a CEQA and RPO significant resource. Loss of this site would be a significant impact.	M-CR-2a. To preserve the integrity of CA-SDI-682, the applicant shall cap Loci A and B per County of San Diego standards, landscaped as part of the overall development and placed in an open space easement. A Preservation Plan describing the methods and ultimate disposition of the capped site area has been prepared and is included as Appendix I of the Cultural Resources Report. The location of the conservation open space easement is shown in Figure 4 of the Preservation Plan. M-CR-2b. For the protection of archaeological site CA-SDI-682, Loci A and Loci B, the applicant shall prepare and implement a temporary fencing plan during any grading activities with one hundred feet. The fencing plan shall be prepared in consultation with a qualified archaeologist to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use. The fenced area shall include a buffer sufficient to protect the	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		archaeological site. The fence shall be installed under the supervision of the qualified archaeologist prior to commencement of grading or brushing and be removed only after grading operations have been completed.	
3.4 Cultural Resources (cont.)	CR-3. Locus C of CA-SDI-682 consists of sparse, deeply buried deposits and it is possible that significant undetected, intact archaeological deposits exist below the ground surface.	M-CR-3. A professional archaeologist shall monitor grading in the vicinity of Loci C, as well as the area north of existing SR-76. A Monitoring Discovery Plan shall be prepared prior to commencement of construction activity, to be put in use in the event archeological deposits are discovered. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing, and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.	Less than significant
	CR-4. Due to the large number of cultural resources in the vicinity, there is a potential for buried deposits to be uncovered during grading within the off-site areas.	M-CR-4. A professional archaeologist shall monitor grading and subsurface excavation in off-site areas. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing and grading monitoring shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.	Less than significant
	CR-5. Due to the large number of cultural resources in the vicinity, there is a potential for significant human remains to be uncovered during grading.	M-CR-5. A professional archaeologist shall monitor grading and subsurface excavation in on- and off-site areas not covered by CR-1 and CR-3. All artifacts recovered during all phases of survey, testing, and grading monitoring shall be curated	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility with San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.	
3.5 Noise	N-1. Exterior noise levels adjacent to the major roadways are projected to exceed the County's standard of 60 community noise equivalent level (CNEL) and result in a significant impact.	M-N-1. The Proposed Project shall construct noise attenuation barriers ranging from three to ten feet along the edge of the residential pads, as shown in Figures 3.5-4 and 3.5-7. Barriers shall be free of cracks and holes. The transmission loss through a barrier should be at least 10 decibels greater than the estimated barrier attenuation (Federal Highway Administration 1979:34). If a barrier attenuates noise levels by 10 decibels at a receiver location, the barrier transmission loss must be at least 20 decibels to prevent audible noise from traveling through the barrier and adding to the acoustical environment. Examples of acceptable barrier materials include, but are not limited to, masonry block, wood frame with stucco, 0.5-inch-thick Plexiglas, or 0.25-inch-thick plate glass. If transparent barrier materials are used, no gaps shall occur between the panels. Figure 3.5-6 shows the barriers that would be required if the Campus Park project was constructed before the Proposed Project. As shown in Figure 3.5-6 several noise barriers at the southwest portion of Planning Area 1 as shown on Figure 3.5-4 would not be required with development of the Campus Park project.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.5 Noise (cont.)	N-2. Second-floor exterior noise levels in the multi-family units are projected to exceed 60 dB(A) CNEL. Therefore, interior noise levels may exceed the 45 CNEL standard.	M-N-2 A noise protection easement shall be placed on those lots where exterior noise levels exceed 60 CNEL to assure that at such time as architectural plans are available, and prior to the issuance of building permits, an interior acoustical analysis shall be conducted in accordance with the State Building Code and County standards. If interior allowable noise levels are met by requiring that windows be unopenable or closed, the design for the structure must also specify a ventilation or air-conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment, as specified in the State Building Code.	Less than significant
	N-3. Noise level at the residences directly north of the WWTP would be exceed County standard .	M-N-3. To reduce noise levels from the WWTP, the Proposed Project shall construct a 10-foot barrier at the property line south of Planning Area 1 and north of SR-76.	Less than significant
3.6 Hazards	HZ-1. Two irrigation ponds on-site that were not sampled have the potential for levels of chemical residues that would be significant.	M-HZ-1. Prior to grading, irrigation water shall be removed from the two on-site irrigation ponds and soil samples from the bottom of the ponds shall be collected and analyzed for potential agricultural residues, to the satisfaction of the Director of DEH. If contamination is present, evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of DEH that all contaminated soils from the irrigation ponds have been remediated under the oversight of the DEH's SAM Program or removed and properly disposed of at an appropriately permitted facility, in accordance with government agency regulations.	Less than significant

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
3.6 Hazards (cont.)	HZ-2. Smudge pots are located at several locations within the Project Site and they appear to have been impacted by total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH).	M-HZ-2. Prior to grading, surficial soil in the vicinity of the smudge pots and elsewhere on the property where minor surficial staining is evident shall be excavated, removed from the site, and properly disposed of at an appropriately permitted facility, in accordance with government agency regulations.	Less than significant
	HZ-3. Demolition of existing structures on the Project Site could result in the release of asbestos and/or lead.	M-HZ-3a. Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities, a facility survey shall be performed to determine the presence or absence of asbestos containing materials (ACMs). Suspect materials that will be disturbed by the demolition or renovation activities shall be sampled and analyzed for asbestos content, or assumed to be asbestos containing. The survey shall be conducted by a person certified by Cal/OSHA pursuant to regulations implementing subdivision (b) of Section 9021.5 of the Labor Code, and shall have taken and passed an EPA-approved Building Inspector Course. Should regulated asbestos containing materials be found, it shall be handled in compliance with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District Rule 361.145 – Standard for Demolition and Renovation. Evidence of completion of the facility survey shall consist of a signed, stamped statement from the person certified to complete the facility survey indicating that the survey has been completed and that either regulated asbestos is present or absent. If present, the letter shall describe the procedures that shall be taken to remediate the hazard.	Less than significant
		M-HZ-3b. Prior to issuance of a building permit	

TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE THE EFFECTS
(continued)

Subchapter/Issue	Potential Effects	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance with Mitigation
		that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities, a survey shall be performed by a California Department of Health Services (DHS) certified lead inspector/risk assessor to determine the presence or absence of lead based paint (LBP). All lead containing materials scheduled for demolition must comply with applicable regulations for demolition methods and dust suppression. Lead containing materials shall be managed in accordance with applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Division 4.5), the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1), and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8).	Less than significant